DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 439 TM 000 165

AUTHOR	Weiss, David J.
TITLE	Test Reviewing: Problems and Prospects.
INSTITUTICN	Inter-Association Council on Test Reviewing.
PUB DATE	Aug 70
NOTE	53p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.75
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation, *Information Dissemination, Information Processing, Measurement Instruments, *Surveys, Technical Reports, *Test Reviews, Tests

AESTRACT

The Inter-Association Council on Test Reviewing (IACTR) was established in 1967 as an outcome of a committee established two years earlier by the Division of Evaluation and Measurement of the American Psychological Association. Its purpose is to facilitate the dissemination of information on, and reviews of, tests and other measurement instruments. To this end, IACTR surveyed various test users and journal editors to ascertain their evaluation of the nature and availability of existing test reviews, and of current reviewing procedures. An analysis of the resulting data is presented in a ccmprehensive set of tables. In general, it was concluded that there is a need for more and improved test reviews that are comparative, comprehensive, integrative, and topical in nature, and designed for specific audiences. In addition, the dissemination procedures need to be improved. Recommendations for the improvement of the reviewing and dissemination processes are included. (Author/PR)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED044439

Test Reviewing: Problems and Prospects

David J. Weiss

University of Minnesota

A report of surveys of test users and journal editors
conducted by the
Inter-Association Council on Test Reviewing

August 1970

TM 000 165

Contents

Introduction 1
The Surveys 2
  Test users survey 2
  Journal editors survey 4
  Analysis 4
Problems in Test Reviewing 5
  Number of test reviews 5
  Nature of test reviews 5
  Depth, availability and frequency of test reviews 9
    Depth 9
    Availability 9
    Frequency 9
Prospects 12
  General direction of new programs 12
  Type of reviews 14
    Comprehensive and integrative reviews 14
    Comparative reviews 16
    Topical reviews 16
    New tests 16
    Comparison of types of test reviews 16
  Dissemination 17
    Periodical publication 17
    Separate subject matter publications 18
    Separates available by mail 18
    More reviews in existing journals 18
    Comparison of dissemination approaches 18
    Prospects for subscribers 18
  Who should review tests? 22
Other Results of the Surveys 24
  Test users survey 24
    Obtaining information on tests 24
    The Mental Measurements Yearbooks 25
  Journal editors survey 28
  Suggestions of the respondents 36
Summary and Implications 37

Appendixes
  Appendix A: Supplementary tables (Tables A-1 through A-7).. 39
  Appendix B: Journals cooperating in journal editors survey. 46
  Appendix C: Comments of journal editors 47
  Appendix D: Comments of test users (distributed separately on request)

Test Reviewing: Problems and Prospects

David J. Weiss

University of Minnesota

Introduction

A comprehensive test reviewing process is desirable for at least three reasons. First, test reviews provide valuable information to test users in terms of selection, use, and interpretation of data from psychological instruments. Secondly, test reviews are a means of providing information to test authors and test publishers about the desirable and undesirable characteristics of the instruments they publish. As a result of this kind of information, test publishers and authors may improve instruments with subsequent benefit to the users of psychometric instruments. A third important reason for the existence of test reviewing programs, is to provide a vehicle for the exercise of professional influence over the kinds of instruments published for use in the provision of psychological services, and in psychological research. While many test reviews are not directly aimed at meeting the ethical responsibilities of the profession, they may have an indirect effect by providing relevant information to both test users and test publishers.

By far the vast majority of test reviews have been published by Oscar Buros in the Mental Measurements Yearbooks (MMY) series. In the thirty years during which Professor Buros has published six MMYs (a seventh is now in preparation) he has critically reviewed virtually every published psychological test, inventory, and questionnaire. A small minority of test reviews appears in various psychological journals, with the number of reviews beginning to show an increase in the last few years. However, because of pressures on journals for publishing other types of materials, test reviews have not been given a prominent position in the press for space in current journals.

In 1965, an ad hoc committee of the Division of Evaluation and Measurement (Division 5) of the American Psychological Association was convened to determine whether current test reviewing procedures were meeting the needs in the field. After two years of discussion of the problem with leading individuals in measurement, education, and related fields, the Division 5 committee felt that the formation of a more permanent vehicle to coordinate test reviewing activities would be appropriate. The committee then contacted all relevant organizations and held a series of meetings with interested organizations to discuss the possible direction of a coordinated effort in the field of test reviewing. These discussions lead to formation of the Inter-Association Council on Test Reviewing (IACTR), which was formally established in 1967. The purpose of IACTR is "to promote and facilitate the dissemination of information about and critiques of published psychological and educational tests, including devices and materials for evaluation and prediction." IACTR is composed of representatives of a number of organizations with interests in the use of psychological and educational assessment devices.

Since its founding, IACTR has been concerned with studying the problem in more detail, to arrive at a permanent solution to what appeared to be the problems in the area of test reviewing. At its first annual meeting in 1968, IACTR formulated plans for a survey of test users and journal editors to further clarify the problems in test reviewing and to obtain the reactions of test users to some of the prospective solutions to these problems. This report is based on the findings of these surveys.

The Surveys

Test Users Survey

A "test user" was defined as a member of an organization which was conconerned with use of psychological tests and assessment devices in individual assessment or research. Eleven organizations were selected using this criterion. The names of the organizations and the abbreviations used in this report are shown in Table 1. All questionnaires were mailed in the spring of 1969.

The most recent membership lists were obtained for each of the 11 organizations. Within each membership list, 216 names were selected by random procedures. Each person so selected was sent a questionnaire and a cover letter describing the purpose of the survey. The questionnaire asked a number of questions concerned with specific problems and prospects in the field of test reviewing. It also included a demographic data page designed to obtain information to describe the samples from which the data were obtained. Descriptive characteristics of the respondents are shown in Appendix Tables A-1 through A-4 for the total group and separately for each organizational subgroup. Appendix Tables A-5 and A-6 give information on the kinds of assessment instruments used by respondents.

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 1 shows the percentage of returns by group, and the percent of total group represented by each of the 11 organizations. As Table 1 indicates, the lowest percentage of returns (39.4%) was from the Division of Clinical Psychologists (Division 12) of the American Psychological Association (APA). Divisions 15 and 16 of APA also had relatively low returns. The two organizations with the highest rate of returns were the Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance (AMEG) with 61.1% responding, and the National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA) with 60.2% responding. Accordingly, these latter two groups represented over 10% of the total analysis group of 1,147 respondents.

Two groups whose members were also likely to have an interest in psychological testing were not specifically sampled in this survey. These were the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME) and Division 5 of the American Psychological Association. However, a cross tabulation of organizational membership for those organizations sampled with all organizations sampled with the addition of NCME and Division 5 of APA, showed that a portion of the membership of each of those organizations was included in the survey. This cross-tabulation is shown in Appendix Table A-7.

Table 1

Percentage distribution of respondents by organization sampled, and percent responding in each group

Organization	Abbreviation	N	Percent of Total Group	Percent Responding
American Educational Research Association, Division D	AERA, Div. D	112	9.8	54.4
American Rehabilitation Counseling Association	ARCA	103	9.0	47.7
American School Counselors Association	ASCA	103	9.0	47.7
Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance	AMEG	132	11.5	61.1
National Vocational Guidance Association	NVGA	130	11.3	60.2
Society for Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment	SPTPA	107	9.3	49.5
American Psychological Association				
Division 12, Clinical Psychology	APA, Div. 12	85	7.4	39.4
Division 14, Industrial Psychology	APA, Div. 14	98	8.5	45.4
Division 15, Educational Psychology	APA, Div. 15	90	7.8	41.7
Division 16, School Psychology	APA, Div. 16	87	7.6	40.3
Division 17, Counseling Psychology	APA, Div. 17	100	8.7	46.3
Total Group		1,147	---	48.3

As Table A-7 shows, 11.9% of the total group were members of NCME, and 8.8% of the total group were members of Division 5 of APA. These figures agree reasonably well with the percentage composition of the total group by groups actually sampled (see Table 1). Thus, these groups were well represented in the total study group.

However, Table A-7 also shows that other groups which were evenly sampled in the research design were disproportionally represented in the total group as a result of overlapping group memberships. Specifically, the National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA) was represented by 33.8% of the total group of 1,147 respondents. This compares to only 9.9% members of Division 14 of APA members (Industrial) since very few Division 14 members held duplicate membership in other organizations studied. The results for the total group should be interpreted with a consideration of these disproportionate frequencies.

Journal Editors Survey

A separate questionnaire was also sent to journal editors. Some of the questions in the journal editor's survey were identical to those used in the test user survey. Additional questions were asked of journal editors to obtain specific information concerning their views on certain problems not relevant to the test user audience.

A total of 28 questionnaires were mailed to the editors of journals identified as publishing test reviews, or publishing research using psychological and educational assessment devices. Of the number mailed, returns were received from 21 journals, representing a 75% return from the total group mailed. Appendix B lists those journals whose editors cooperated in this survey.

Analysis

Analysis of the data was based on the computation of percentage of respondents choosing each of the multiple choice alternatives in the questionnaires. Some questions asked respondents to respond in a categorical "yes" or "no" response; for these questions the percentage "yes" and the total number responding is reported. In addition, for the "yes-no" questions, several questions asked a relative question in terms of which of several activities was most important or preferred by the respondent.

Because of the possibility of there being group differences in percentage responding, the analysis also included the computation of chi-square tests for significance of the differences among the 11 groups. For those questions which were the same in both the journal editor and the test user survey, the results of the journal editor survey are presented in comparison with the results for the test users. However, because of the small number of journal editors replying to the survey, the results for the journal editors were not included in the computation of chi-square tests of group differences in response frequencies.

Analysis of data was facilitated by a grant of subsidized computer time from the University of Minnesota Computer Center.

Problems in Test Reviewing

Number of test reviews

A question in both the journal editors and test user survey asked "How do you feel about the number of test reviews being published?" Table 2 shows the percentage distributions of responses on the five-point rating scale provided for this question. Of the total group of 1,057 individuals who responded to this question, only 18.5% indicated that there was "no increase required" in the number of test reviews being published. Only 4.3% of the total group indicated that "less" test reviews were appropriate. Combining the three response alternatives indicating that an increase in the number of test reviews would be desirable, 77% of the total group of respondents indicated that more test reviews were appropriate.

Insert Table 2 about here

An analysis of the group differences in response to this question, among the 11 groups studied, yielded a chi-square value of 54.44, with an associated probability level (40 df) of between .10 and .05. This suggested a tendency for the distributions of the responses of the groups to be different. While about 50% of each of the 11 groups indicated that "more" test reviews are needed, 7.6% of the members of the Society for Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment indicated that "less" test reviews are needed, compared to only 1.1% of the members of the American School Counselors Association. In terms of the response of "need many more" test reviews, responses varied from 7.7% for members of APA Division 16 to 19.8% of AERA Division D members.

Among journal editors, 65% of the 20 respondents indicated that "more" test reviews were needed, and an additional 15% responded in each of the categories "need many more", and "need a slight increase." In total, 95% of the journal editors supported the need for some increase in the number of test reviews. None of the journal editors indicated that less test reviews were needed.

The consensus of both journal editors and test users, then, is that more test reviews are needed. Hence, while Buros's Mental Measurements Yearbooks provide a large number of comprehensive test reviews, almost 8 out of 10 potential and actual test users feel the need for an increase in the number of test reviews.

Nature of test reviews

Two questions in the test users survey were concerned with the nature of test reviews. Question 2 asked "How do you feel about the nature of current test reviews?"; respondents were asked to reply on a four-point scale from "much too technical" to "not technical enough". A related question (question 4) asked

Table 2

Percentage distributions for Question 1: How do you feel about the number of test reviews being published?

Group	N	need many more	need more	need a slight increase	no increase required	need less
Total Group	1057	12.3	51.4	13.5	18.5	4.3
AERA, Div. D	101	19.8	52.5	15.8	9.9	2.0
ARCA	103	13.9	45.5	8.9	26.7	5.0
ASCA	95	12.6	45.3	17.9	23.2	1.1
AMEG	128	10.2	57.0	18.0	12.5	2.3
NVGA	121	8.3	52.1	17.4	16.5	5.8
SPTPA	92	14.1	52.2	8.7	17.4	7.6
APA, Div. 12	74	12.2	55.4	5.4	21.6	5.4
APA, Div. 14	91	13.2	51.6	15.4	13.2	6.6
APA, Div. 15	78	10.3	55.1	12.8	17.9	3.8
APA, Div. 16	78	7.7	44.9	11.5	29.5	6.4
APA, Div. 17	98	13.3	52.0	12.2	20.4	2.0
Journal Editors	20	15.0	65.0	15.0	5.0	0.0

$\chi^2(40\ df) = 54.44 \quad .10 < p < .05$

"To what extent do current test reviews meet your needs?"; respondents were asked to characterize test reviews as "too technical", "adequate", or "too practical". The second question was also asked of journal editors, in terms of how well test reviews meet the needs "of test users".

For the first of the two questions (see Table 3), about half of the total group of respondents felt that the nature of current test reviews is "about right"; 51% of the total group of respondents chose this alternative. However, 31.5% of the total group indicated that test reviews were either "too technical" or "much too technical". Only 17.4% indicated that current test reviews are "not technical enough".

Insert Table 3 about here

Analysis of the organizational sub-group differences in response to this question yielded a value of chi-square significant well beyond the .01 level of statistical significance. This indicated wide differences among the members of the 11 organizations in terms of their responses to this question. In general, the members of APA, the Society for Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, and AERA Division D, tended to indicate more than the other groups, that test reviews were "not technical enough". For these groups, the percentage choosing the latter response varied from 20.5% to 26.3%. Among the groups representing the American Personnel and Guidance Association (ARCA, ASCA, AMEG and NVGA) the percentage indicating that current test reviews were "not technical enough" varied from a low of 6.3% to 10.5%.

A similar contrast is shown in the percentages of respondents indicating that test reviews were "too technical" or "much too technical". Only 15.1% of the members of the Division of Industrial Psychologists of APA (Division 14) indicated that test reviews were either "too technical" or "much too technical". This contrasts with a total of 50.5% of the ARCA members and 53.7% of the ASCA members choosing these alternatives. The percentage of individuals indicating test reviews were "much too technical" varied from 0% for members of APA Division 14, to 12.1% of ARCA members.

These results, indicating large and statistically significant differences among the members of various organizations, suggest that test reviews need to be written at various levels of technical sophistication. It would appear that members of the more applied groups such as ARCA, ASCA, AMEG and NVGA require test reviews at a lower level of technical sophistication, than those of the more research-oriented groups such as are found among the APA membership.

These results are supported by the findings on the related question "To what extent do current test reviews meet your needs?". The response distributions for that question are shown in Table 4. As Table 4 indicates, 51.6% of the total group indicated that current test reviews were adequate, with more than twice as many of the remaining 50% indicating that test reviews were "too technical" as opposed to "too practical". Among the 11 organizations sampled, statistically significant differences were again found in response to this question. While only 15.9% of APA

Table 3
Percentage distributions for Question 2: How do you feel about the nature of current test reviews?

Group	N	much too technical	too technical	about right	not technical enough
Total Group	1041	4.1	27.4	51.1	17.4
AERA, Div. D	99	1.0	17.2	55.6	26.3
ARCA	99	12.1	38.4	39.4	10.1
ASCA	95	2.1	51.6	40.0	6.3
AMEG	124	6.5	29.2	54.8	10.5
NVGA	124	4.0	36.3	49.2	10.5
SPTPA	90	6.7	24.4	45.6	23.3
APA, Div. 12	73	5.5	13.7	56.2	24.7
APA, Div. 14	86	0.0	15.1	61.6	23.3
APA, Div. 15	76	1.3	17.1	57.9	23.7
APA, Div. 16	78	1.3	30.8	47.4	20.5
APA, Div. 17	97	3.1	19.6	56.7	20.6

χ^2(30 df) = 115.7 p <.01

Division 14 members indicated that test reviews were "too technical", 57.1% of ASCA members chose that response. Over 20% of AERA Division D, APA Division 14, and Division 15 members chose the "too practical" alternative, while only 4.1% of ASCA and 6.5% of AMEG members agreed that test reviews are "too practical".

Insert Table 4 about here

Interestingly enough, 26.7% of the journal editors indicated that test reviews were "too technical", while 60% supported the statement that test reviews were adequately meeting the needs in the field. On this question, journal editors tended to agree more with the members of the APA than with members of the applied groups represented by APGA membership.

Depth, availability, and frequency of test reviews

Test users were asked "Do you feel that current methods of dissemination of test reviews are adequately meeting the needs in the field in terms of the depth, availability and frequency of test reviews?" Users were requested to respond "yes" or "no" to each of these three possible problems. Percentage distributions for the percent responding "yes" to each of these three alternatives are shown in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

Depth. Among the total group, 46.8% indicated that current test reviews meet existing needs in terms of "depth". Analysis of the group differences of response to this question indicated no statistically significant differences in response among the members of the 11 organizations sampled. Percentages varied from 34.7% for APA, Division 12 to 55% for NVGA members. In general, then, it would appear that only about half of the respondents to this question indicated that the "depth" of current test reviews is appropriate.

Availability. The percentage responding "yes" to the question of "availability of test reviews" was only 32% for the total group. The sub-group percentages ranged from 22.7% for APA Division 16 members to 43.6% for APA Division 15 members. However, no significant differences occurred among the subgroups. The data indicate, however, that two out of three test users are not satisfied with the availability of test reviews.

Frequency. The picture appears to be even more bleak for the question of "frequency of test reviews". Only 22.9% of the total group indicated that test reviews are frequent enough in terms of the needs of the field. Responses for the subgroups varied from 10.7% for APA Division 16 (9 our of 10 of respondents to this question said that test reviews are not frequent enough) to 32.2% for members of SPTPA. Differences among the subgroups were statistically significant, indicating different needs among subgroup members concerning timeliness of test reviews.

These data point up three important problems in test reviewing. First, almost eight out of ten test users feel that test reviews are not frequent enough. Seven out of ten feel that test reviews are not readily available, and slightly over half of the test reviewing audience feels that test reviews

Table 4
Percentage distributions for Question 4:
To what extent do current test reviews meet your needs?

Group	N	too technical	adequate	too practical
Total Group	1011	34.7	51.6	13.6
AERA, Div. D	93	20.4	57.0	22.6
ARCA	97	49.5	42.3	8.2
ASCA	98	57.1	38.8	4.1
AMEG	123	39.0	54.5	6.5
NVGA	120	41.7	50.8	7.5
SPTPA	93	31.2	49.5	19.4
APA, Div. 12	67	25.4	56.7	17.9
APA, Div. 14	82	15.9	63.4	20.7
APA, Div. 15	72	26.4	51.4	22.2
APA, Div. 16	73	38.4	43.8	17.8
APA, Div. 17	93	25.8	61.3	12.9
Journal Editors	15	26.7	60.0	13.3

$\chi^2(20\ df) = 86.0 \quad p < .01$

Table 5
Number of individuals and percent choosing "yes" for the sub-parts of Question 7:
Do you feel that current methods of dissemination of test reviews...
are adequately meeting the needs in the field in terms of...

Group	the depth of test reviews? N	%Yes	the availability of test reviews? N	%Yes	the frequency of test reviews N	%Yes
Total Group	1030	46.8	1043	32.2	1021	22.9
AERA, Div. D	98	39.8	102	31.4	99	15.2
ARCA	99	51.5	100	29.0	99	22.2
ASCA	93	54.9	94	34.0	91	31.9
AMEG	123	45.5	123	29.5	122	19.7
NVGA	120	55.0	122	31.1	119	23.5
SPTPA	89	37.1	90	37.8	87	32.2
APA, Div. 12	72	34.7	75	32.0	72	23.6
APA, Div. 14	88	48.9	88	31.8	87	21.8
APA, Div. 15	77	49.4	78	43.6	74	29.7
APA, Div. 16	74	43.2	75	22.7	75	10.7
APA, Div. 17	97	52.6	96	34.8	96	22.9
Chi-square	17.4		10.8		20.9	
df	10		10		10	
p	N.S.		N.S.		$\leq .05$	

are not adequate in terms of depth. These results are similar to those identified in the early meetings of IACTR with organizational representatives, and were the kind of information which lead to the development of several prospective solutions to some of these problems. These solutions formed the second half of the survey.

Prospects

General Direction of New Programs

Test users and journal editors were asked "Should new test reviewing efforts concentrate on "more test reviews", "different types of test reviews", and "bibliographies for tests". Respondents were asked to reply categorically "yes" or "no" for each of the three alternatives, then to indicate which of the three was most important. Percentage distributions of responses to these questions are shown in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 about here

As Table 6 indicates, 70.1% of the 975 test users responding to this question indicated that new test reviewing efforts should be concerned with "more test reviews". Among the responding organizations, the percentage responding "yes" to the question of "more test reviews" varied from 62.5% for members of ASCA to 79.3% for members of Division D of AERA. The chi-square value of 13.7 for group differences in the responses to this question was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Hence the total group percentage of 70% would be representative of the responses for each of the subgroups. Journal editors agreed with test users on this question. A total of 77.8% of the journal editors responding to this question indicated that "more test reviews" is an appropriate direction for future efforts in the test reviewing field.

Concerning the question of "different types of test reviews", 89.9% of the total group endorsed this as an appropriate direction for future efforts. Among the sampled groups, 79.3% of APA Division 14 members indicated that "different types" of test reviews were appropriate, while 94.6% of APA Division 17 members expressed a preference for this alternative. The differences among organizations in response to this question were statistically significant at the 5% level. This, of course, supports the previously observed differences among responding subgroups in terms of their dissatisfaction with the nature of current test reviews. However, the preferences expressed in responses to this question for new kinds of test reviews are even more marked than they were in responses to previous questions. Among journal editors, 87.5% agreed that "different types" of test reviews were appropriate. Again journal editors and test users were in general agreement as to the future direction of new test reviewing efforts.

The question of "bibliographies for tests" yielded a somewhat different picture. While 63.3% of the total group indicated that new test reviewing efforts should include bibliographies, the percentages varied widely among the responding subgroups, and results were statistically significant. Only slightly more than half (53.0%) of the APA Division 16 members endorsed the

Table 6
Number of individuals and percent choosing "yes" for the sub-parts of Question 5:
Should new test reviewing efforts concentrate on...

Group	a. more test reviews? N	a. %Yes	b. different types of test reviews? N	b. %Yes	c. bibliographies for tests? N	c. %Yes	Of the three activities, which is most important? N	a	b	c
Total Group	975	70.1	996	89.9	958	63.3	1018	28.1	57.9	14.0
AERA, Div. D	92	79.3	91	84.6	92	77.2	98	29.6	52.0	18.4
ARCA	91	65.9	93	91.4	89	56.2	92	27.2	58.7	14.1
ASCA	88	62.5	95	92.6	87	62.1	93	19.4	69.9	10.8
AMEG	121	75.2	126	90.5	118	66.9	125	28.8	58.4	12.8
NVGA	112	73.2	115	93.0	115	54.8	122	26.2	59.8	13.9
SPTPA	89	64.0	87	87.4	88	69.3	87	19.5	59.8	20.7
APA, Div. 12	65	69.2	67	92.5	65	67.7	70	32.9	50.0	17.1
APA, Div. 14	82	67.1	82	79.3	84	64.3	85	31.8	51.8	16.5
APA, Div. 15	75	66.7	74	90.5	64	56.2	77	36.4	57.1	6.5
APA, Div. 16	67	65.7	73	90.4	66	53.0	74	27.0	60.8	12.2
APA, Div. 17	93	76.3	93	94.6	90	65.6	95	32.6	55.8	11.6
Journal Editors	18	77.8	16	87.5	16	62.5	....	....	....	....
Chi-square	13.7		18.7		20.4		22.6			
df	10		10		10		20			
P	N.S.		<.05		<.05		N.S.			

need for bibliographies, while 77.2% of the AERA Division D members supported that prospect. This would suggest that the more research-oriented groups, such as AERA, have a greater need for bibliographic material than the more applied groups such as Divisions 16 and 15 of APA and NVGA members. Journal editors were in general agreement with the total group, as 62.5% of the journal editors endorsed the need for bibliographies.

When the test users were asked to indicate which of the three activities was the most important direction for new test reviewing efforts, the preference was clearly for "different types" of test reviews. Among the total group, 57.9% indicated that "different types" of test reviews were the most important, while only 14% supported "bibliographies" and 28% supported "more test reviews". The chi-square analysis of the response distributions for this comparative question indicated no statistically significant differences among the responding subgroups. All groups agreed that "different types" of test reviews are the most important of the three options given.

Type of reviews

Anticipating the need for different types of test reviews, based on earlier discussions with representatives of the organizations involved in IACTR, the questionnaire presented four different types of test reviews to both the journal editor and the test user audience. The question in both surveys was worded as follows "For each type of test review listed below indicate whether or not you feel it is (or could be) an important kind of test review: (a) comprehensive and integrative reviews of the research on a test (b) comparative reviews of measuring instruments of the same type (e.g., reviews comparing the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and the Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, or the Stanford-Binet and the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale); (c) topical reviews, e.g., reviews of the 'measurement of intelligence', reading, achievement, etc. (d) reviews of new tests as they appear, based primarily on the information in the manual." Respondents were directed to reply "yes" or "no" to each of these four alternatives. In addition, the survey questionnaires asked the following question "Of the four types of reviews listed above, which type do you feel is the most important?" This question was designed to obtain an indication of the relative importance of the various types, in terms of setting priorities for the development of new test reviewing efforts.

Table 7 shows the percentage responding "yes" to each of the four alternatives, and the percentage choosing each of the alternatives as the "most important" type of review.

Insert Table 7 about here

Comprehensive and integrative reviews. Among the total group, 88.2% of the 1,055 respondents indicated that "comprehensive and integrative" reviews of the research on a test was an important kind of test review. Response percentages among the organizational subgroups varied from 73.8% for the members of NVGA to about 95% for members of Divisions 12 and 14 of APA. Differences were statistically significant among the organizational subgroups, reflecting the different needs of the groups, based probably on the

Table 7

Number of individuals and percent choosing "yes" for the sub-parts of Question 3: For each type of test review listed below indicate whether or not you feel it is (or could be) an important kind of test review

Group	a. comprehensive and integrative		b. comparative reviews		c. topical reviews		d. new tests		of the four types listed, which is most important?				
	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	Percent a	b	c	d
Total Group	1055	88.2	1079	94.6	1044	87.6	1028	58.9	1002	38.3	38.4	16.7	6.6
AERA, Div. D	104	91.3	104	95.2	102	90.2	96	65.6	90	37.8	33.3	20.0	8.9
ARCA	98	89.8	102	93.1	98	83.7	98	50.0	89	41.6	42.7	14.6	1.1
ASCA	92	76.1	98	95.9	94	86.2	89	62.9	89	23.6	52.8	18.0	5.6
AMEG	123	88.6	130	98.5	124	91.9	121	62.0	119	28.6	47.1	12.6	11.8
NVGA	122	73.8	126	93.6	122	91.0	124	53.3	117	23.1	47.0	20.5	9.4
SPTPA	99	91.9	99	92.9	97	83.5	92	62.0	95	54.7	28.4	14.7	2.1
APA, Div. 12	75	94.7	77	93.5	73	76.7	73	54.8	71	52.1	26.8	18.3	2.8
APA, Div. 14	89	94.4	90	91.1	88	87.5	88	53.4	88	45.4	30.7	18.2	5.7
APA, Div. 15	81	92.6	78	91.0	76	88.2	78	62.8	76	42.1	28.9	18.4	10.5
APA, Div. 16	74	87.8	77	97.4	74	90.5	74	60.8	77	35.1	42.9	11.7	10.4
APA, Div. 17	98	93.9	98	96.9	96	90.6	95	56.8	91	47.3	34.1	16.5	2.2
Journal Editors	21	95.2	21	95.2	20	90.0	20	75.0	22	50.0	13.6	31.8	4.5
Chi-square	50.6		11.9		16.6		8.9		75.14				
df	10		10		10		10		30				
P	<.01		N.S.		N.S.		N.S.		<.01				

activities of the constituent members. Journal editors endorsed this alternative at the rate of 95.2%, agreeing more with APA members than with members of the applied organizations.

Comparative reviews. About 95% of the total group of test users and 95% of the group of journal editors agreed that comparative reviews were an important kind of review. Analysis of the differences in percentages among the test user subgroups showed that only 91% of APA Division 15 members supported the need for comparative reviews while 98.5% of AMEG members desired comparative reviews of tests. Differences among organizational groups were not statistically significant. It is important to note that while over nine out of ten of the members of all groups studied felt that comparative reviews were important kinds of reviews, very few of the reviews now being published are of a comparative nature.

Topical reviews. Support for the alternative of topical reviews was expressed by 87.6% of the test users and 90% of the journal editors. Among the organizational subgroups, only 76.7% of APA Division 12 members endorsed this alternative while 90.6% of APA Division 17 members supported the notion of topical reviews. However, differences among organizational subgroups were not statistically significant. Again, the topical review which is rarely now available was endorsed by almost nine out of ten members of all groups studied.

New tests. Test users and journal editors disagreed with each other on whether reviews of new tests were desirable. Of the total group of test users, only 58.9% of the respondents endorsed the need for reviews of new tests. Among journal editors 75% endorsed this alternative. This difference suggests that journal editors perhaps are not fully aware of the desires of test users, and are producing test reviews of new tests because of their inaccurate perception of the needs of test users.

Among the test users subgroups, only 50% of ARCA members were interested in the reviewing of new tests, while 63% of ASCA members were interested in this type of test review. However, the differences among test user subgroups were not statistically significant.

Comparison of types of test reviews. When test users were asked to choose among the four types of test reviews in terms of the one which is "most important", the total group's results were equally divided between two types of reviews that are frequently not currently available. About 38% of the total group of test users indicated that the "comprehensive and integrative" reviews were most important, while an additional 38% indicated that "comparative reviews" were most important. It is interesting to note that for the type of test reviews currently most prevalent in reviewing journals, only 6.6% of the total group indicated that the reviewing of "new tests" was the most important of the four types of reviews; ninety-three out of 100 respondents indicated that other types of reviews were more important.

Interestingly enough, similar results were found for journal editors. Only 4.5% indicated that reviews of "new tests" were most important (contrary to the current practice in journal test reviews), while half of the journal editors felt that comprehensive and integrative reviews of the research on a

test were the most important of the four types given. The journal editors disagreed, however, with the test users in terms of the desirability of topical reviews vs. comparative reviews. About 32% of journal editors supported topical reviews as most important while only almost half that proportion (16.7%) of test users endorsed topical reviews as most important of the four alternatives. Test users felt comparative reviews to more important (38.4%) while journal editors felt these to be less important (13.6%). These findings can possibly reflect the differential needs of the average test user and the perceptions of those needs by journal editors in terms of the research vs. practical nature of test reviews.

Analysis of the subgroup differences in responses to the comparative question of type of test reviews indicated a highly statistically significant difference in responses among these subgroups. For five of the 11 subgroups, comprehensive and integrative test reviews were the most important of the four types listed. These groups were the SPTPA and the following four divisions of APA: Divisions 12, 14, 15 and 17. For these groups about 50% of the choices were for comprehensive and integrative types of test reviews. Comprehensive and integrative reviews were also chosen most frequently by members of AERA Division D; however, the difference between the percentage choosing that response (37.8) and the percentage choosing comparative reviews (33.3%) was not as great.

Four of the 11 groups clearly chose comparative reviews as most important of the four types. Percentages for these four groups ranged from 42.9% (APA Division 17) to 52.8% (ASCA members). For none of the groups was topical reviews or reviews of new tests the most important of the four types of reviews. The percent choosing new tests as the most important varied from a low of 2.2% for APA Division 16 to a high of 11.8% for members of AMEG. These data indicate, in general, that different test reviewing populations require different kinds of reviews to meet their needs.

Dissemination

The yearly discussions of IACTR and the preliminary Division 5 subcommittee discussions also were concerned with new methods for dissemination of test reviews. Accordingly, both the journal editors survey and the test user survey included the following question: "Should test reviewing efforts expand in the direction of a) A separate periodical publication devoted exclusively to a variety of types of test reviews for all kinds of tests; b) A series of separate publications by broad subject matter headings, e.g., tests of intelligence, measures of personality, Elementary School tests, Secondary School tests, etc. c) Separates for individual tests available from a central source by mail; and d) More reviews in existing journals." Both journal editors and test users were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to each of these four alternatives. In addition the test user groups were asked to indicate "Of the four possibilities, which is the most important?"

Periodical publication. Table 8 shows the percentage distribution of the responses to this series of questions. For the total group of test users, 58.9% endorsed the possibility of a separate periodical publication, while 47% of the journal editors supported that means of dissemination. Among the 11 test user groups sampled, responses ranged from 45.3% "yes" for APA Division 14 members to 67.5% for members of AMEG. Differences among

the groups were statistically significant. In general, the idea of a separate periodical publication was supported more by groups which were not members of APA, with the exception of SPTPA.

Insert Table 8 about here

Separate subject matter publications. On the question of separate subject matter publications, 69% of the total group supported that as an alternative. For this question, only 47% of journal editors supported the idea of a separate subject matter publication. Among the 11 responding groups, percentage endorsing this alternative ranged from 56.8% for members of Division 15 of APA to a high of 88.3% for ASCA members, with differences statistically significant at the .01 level. It is interesting to note that the percentage responding "yes" for journal editors was substantially below the percentage responding "yes" for almost all of the test user groups.

Separates available by mail. The difference in opinion between journal editors and test users was even more pronounced on the question of the availability of separate test reviews for individual tests through a "mail order house". Only 25% of journal editors endorsed this alternative, while over twice as many (57.7%) of the total group of test users endorsed this possibility. While subgroups of the test users varied from 48.9% to 68.9% "yes", the differences among test user groups were not statistically significant.

More reviews in existing journals. On the question of more reviews in existing journals, the journal editors and test users again disagreed somewhat. Among the journal editors, 72.2% supported this possibility, while only 58.6% of test users supported the dissemination of more test reviews in existing journals. The test user sub-groups responded significantly differently on this question. Only 45% of members of SPTPA supported this alternative dissemination mechanism, compared to a high of 69.3% of the members of APA Division 15.

Comparison of dissemination approaches. In comparing the four alternative methods of dissemination of test reviews, statistically significant differences were found among the 11 test user groups. The members of ASCA clearly chose "separate subject matter publications" as the most important (52.7%) as did members of NVGA. Members of most other organizations also chose this approach as most important, although the result was not as clear. SPTPA members were equally distributed between "separate periodical publication" and "separate subject matter publications" as their first choice. AMEG members preferred the "separate periodical publication" to "separate subject matter publications" by a small margin. While none of the groups gave a majority preference to the possibility of more reviews in existing journals, the percentages responding to this as the most appropriate alternative varied from 5.4% for ASCA members to 24.7% for APA Division 15 members. These results tend to suggest, however, that different dissemination mechanisms might be appropriate for different subgroups of the test user population.

Prospects for subscribers. In an attempt to obtain a more definite statement of the "market" possibilities for some specific new methods of dissemination, the following question was asked of test users: "Which of the following new methods of dissemination of test reviews would you patronize? a) a reprint service from which you could purchase all reviews done

Table 8

Number of individuals and percent choosing "yes" for the sub-parts of Question 6: Should test reviewing efforts expand in the direction of...

Group	a. separate periodical publication		b. separate subject matter publications		c. separates for individual tests by mail		d. more reviews in existing journals		Of the four possibilities, which is the most important?				
										Percent			
	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	a	b	c	d
Total Group	1007	58.9	1007	69.0	992	57.7	1001	58.6	1003	29.6	39.2	15.2	16.0
AERA, Div. D	95	63.2	100	72.0	92	48.9	93	65.6	95	29.4	41.0	9.5	20.0
ARCA	95	64.2	91	60.4	92	57.6	94	61.7	95	29.5	36.8	15.8	17.9
ASCA	90	66.7	94	88.3	92	54.3	88	45.4	93	28.0	52.7	14.0	5.4
AMEG	120	67.5	121	71.9	119	68.9	120	66.7	122	35.2	32.0	21.3	11.5
NVGA	117	61.5	118	73.7	116	54.3	118	63.6	116	22.4	46.6	12.9	18.1
SPTPA	96	52.1	91	68.1	94	59.6	91	45.0	89	32.6	32.6	19.1	15.7
APA, Div. 12	69	52.2	67	65.7	70	65.7	73	53.4	68	26.5	33.8	22.1	17.7
APA, Div. 14	86	45.3	86	62.8	85	61.2	87	52.9	85	30.6	36.7	20.0	12.9
APA, Div. 15	71	54.9	74	56.8	72	52.8	75	69.3	77	29.9	33.8	11.7	24.7
APA, Div. 16	75	58.7	74	68.9	72	55.6	72	56.9	75	32.0	41.3	13.3	13.3
APA, Div. 17	93	54.8	91	63.7	88	53.4	90	60.0	88	29.5	42.0	6.8	21.6
Journal Editors	17	47.0	17	47.0	16	25.0	18	72.2	..	..	..	..	..
Chi-square	18.8		29.9		13.9		25.5		44.9				
df	10		10		10		10		30				
P	<.05		<.01		N.S.		<.01		<.05				

test were the most important of the four types given. The journal editors disagreed, however, with the test users in terms of the desirability of topical reviews vs. comparative reviews. About 32% of journal editors supported topical reviews as most important while only almost half that proportion (16.7%) of test users endorsed topical reviews as most important of the four alternatives. Test users felt comparative reviews to more important (38.4%) while journal editors felt these to be less important (13.6%). These findings can possibly reflect the differential needs of the average test user and the perceptions of those needs by journal editors in terms of the research vs. practical nature of test reviews.

Analysis of the subgroup differences in responses to the comparative question of type of test reviews indicated a highly statistically significant difference in responses among these subgroups. For five of the 11 subgroups, comprehensive and integrative test reviews were the most important of the four types listed. These groups were the SPTPA and the following four divisions of APA: Divisions 12, 14, 15 and 17. For these groups about 50% of the choices were for comprehensive and integrative types of test reviews. Comprehensive and integrative reviews were also chosen most frequently by members of AERA Division D; however, the difference between the percentage choosing that response (37.8) and the percentage choosing comparative reviews (33.3%) was not as great.

Four of the 11 groups clearly chose comparative reviews as most important of the four types. Percentages for these four groups ranged from 42.9% (APA Division 17) to 52.8% (ASCA members). For none of the groups was topical reviews or reviews of new tests the most important of the four types of reviews. The percent choosing new tests as the most important varied from a low of 2.2% for APA Division 16 to a high of 11.8% for members of AMEG. These data indicate, in general, that different test reviewing populations require different kinds of reviews to meet their needs.

Dissemination

The yearly discussions of IACTR and the preliminary Division 5 subcommittee discussions also were concerned with new methods for dissemination of test reviews. Accordingly, both the journal editors survey and the test user survey included the following question: "Should test reviewing efforts expand in the direction of a) A separate periodical publication devoted exclusively to a variety of types of test reviews for all kinds of tests; b) A series of separate publications by broad subject matter headings, e.g., tests of intelligence, measures of personality, Elementary School tests, Secondary School tests, etc. c) Separates for individual tests available from a central source by mail; and d) More reviews in existing journals." Both journal editors and test users were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to each of these four alternatives. In addition the test user groups were asked to indicate "Of the four possibilities, which is the most important?"

Periodical publication. Table 8 shows the percentage distribution of the responses to this series of questions. For the total group of test users, 58.9% endorsed the possibility of a separate periodical publication, while 47% of the journal editors supported that means of dissemination. Among the 11 test user groups sampled, responses ranged from 45.3% "yes" for APA Division 14 members to 67.5% for members of AMEG. Differences among

the groups were statistically significant. In general, the idea of a separate periodical publication was supported more by groups which were not members of APA, with the exception of SPTPA.

Insert Table 8 about here

Separate subject matter publications. On the question of separate subject matter publications, 69% of the total group supported that as an alternative. For this question, only 47% of journal editors supported the idea of a separate subject matter publication. Among the 11 responding groups, percentage endorsing this alternative ranged from 56.8% for members of Division 15 of APA to a high of 88.3% for ASCA members, with differences statistically significant at the .01 level. It is interesting to note that the percentage responding "yes" for journal editors was substantially below the percentage responding "yes" for almost all of the test user groups.

Separates available by mail. The difference in opinion between journal editors and test users was even more pronounced on the question of the availability of separate test reviews for individual tests through a "mail order house". Only 25% of journal editors endorsed this alternative, while over twice as many (57.7%) of the total group of test users endorsed this possibility. While subgroups of the test users varied from 48.9% to 68.9% "yes", the differences among test user groups were not statistically significant.

More reviews in existing journals. On the question of more reviews in existing journals, the journal editors and test users again disagreed somewhat. Among the journal editors, 72.2% supported this possibility, while only 58.6% of test users supported the dissemination of more test reviews in existing journals. The test user sub-groups responded significantly differently on this question. Only 45% of members of SPTPA supported this alternative dissemination mechanism, compared to a high of 69.3% of the members of APA Division 15.

Comparison of dissemination approaches. In comparing the four alternative methods of dissemination of test reviews, statistically significant differences were found among the 11 test user groups. The members of ASCA clearly chose "separate subject matter publications" as the most important (52.7%) as did members of NVGA. Members of most other organizations also chose this approach as most important, although the result was not as clear. SPTPA members were equally distributed between "separate periodical publication" and "separate subject matter publications" as their first choice. AMEG members preferred the "separate periodical publication" to "separate subject matter publications" by a small margin. While none of the groups gave a majority preference to the possibility of more reviews in existing journals, the percentages responding to this as the most appropriate alternative varied from 5.4% for ASCA members to 24.7% for APA Division 15 members. These results tend to suggest, however, that different dissemination mechanisms might be appropriate for different subgroups of the test user population.

Prospects for subscribers. In an attempt to obtain a more definite statement of the "market" possibilities for some specific new methods of dissemination, the following question was asked of test users: "Which of the following new methods of dissemination of test reviews would you patronize? a) a reprint service from which you could purchase all reviews done

Table 8

Number of individuals and percent choosing "yes" for the sub-parts of Question 6: Should test reviewing efforts expand in the direction of...

Group	a. separate periodical publication		b. separate subject matter publications		c. separates for individual tests by mail		d. more reviews in existing journals		Of the four possibilities, which is the most important?				
										Percent			
	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	a	b	c	d
Total Group	1007	58.9	1007	69.0	992	57.7	1001	58.6	1003	29.6	39.2	15.2	16.0
AERA, Div. D	95	63.2	100	72.0	92	48.9	93	65.6	95	29.4	41.0	9.5	20.0
ARCA	95	64.2	91	60.4	92	57.6	94	61.7	95	29.5	36.8	15.8	17.9
ASCA	90	66.7	94	88.3	92	54.3	88	45.4	93	28.0	52.7	14.0	5.4
AMEG	120	67.5	121	71.9	119	68.9	120	66.7	122	35.2	32.0	21.3	11.5
NVGA	117	61.5	118	73.7	116	54.3	118	63.6	116	22.4	46.6	12.9	18.1
SPTPA	96	52.1	91	68.1	94	59.6	91	45.0	89	32.6	32.6	19.1	15.7
APA, Div. 12	69	52.2	67	65.7	70	65.7	73	53.4	68	26.5	33.8	22.1	17.7
APA, Div. 14	86	45.3	86	62.8	85	61.2	87	52.9	85	30.6	36.7	20.0	12.9
APA, Div. 15	71	54.9	74	56.8	72	52.8	75	69.3	77	29.9	33.8	11.7	24.7
APA, Div. 16	75	58.7	74	68.9	72	55.6	72	56.9	75	32.0	41.3	13.3	13.3
APA, Div. 17	93	54.8	91	63.7	88	53.4	90	60.0	88	29.5	42.0	6.8	21.6
Journal Editors	17	47.0	17	47.0	16	25.0	18	72.2	..	..	..	..	..
Chi-square	18.8		29.9		13.9		25.5		44.9				
df	10		10		10		10		30				
P	<.05		<.01		N.S.		<.01		<.05				

on a test; b) a review subscription service which would provide you with reviews in given subject matter areas (e.g., intelligence, personality, reading) as they were available; c) a quarterly journal which would publish reviews of all tests and a variety of kinds of reviews (comparative, integrative, new tests); d) hard cover collections of reviews on a subject matter area (e.g., reviews of reading tests, intelligence tests) published at 5-year intervals." The test users were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to each of those four alternatives.

The response distributions for the total group and the 11 subgroups are shown in Table 9. Among the total group 63.8% indicated that they would patronize a "reprint service" providing reviews of specific tests by name. Among the 11 organizational sub-groups, percentage responding "yes" varied from a low of 52.1% for members of Division 15 of APA to a high of 77.4% for AMEG members. Differences among the subgroups were statistically significant. The results show, however, that at least 50% of the members of all groups sampled indicated that they would patronize a reprint review service. Generalization of these results to the total organizational membership of the groups sampled indicates a very large possible source of users of such a reprint service.

Insert Table 9 about here

The possibility of a review subscription service was supported by 67.8% of the total group. While subgroup differences varied from 55.7% for APA Division 15 members to 76.9% for ASCA members, the differences among subgroups were not statistically significant. However, about two out of every three members of the organizations studied indicated their probable patronage of a review subscription service.

On the question of a quarterly journal, again almost two out of every three (65.8%) of the total group indicated that they would support such a service. The percentage responding "yes" varied from 46.5% for APA Division 12 members to 75.6% for NVGA members. The differences between the 11 subgroups were statistically significant, indicating a differential interest in a new journal of test reviews on the part of the members of various organizations. However, at least about one out of two of all respondents supported the creation of a quarterly journal of test reviews, with about three out of four responding affirmatively among the less highly academically oriented groups.

The possibility of a series of hard cover subject matter collections (similar to the kinds of review collections currently being published by the Mental Measurements Yearbooks, e.g., Personality Tests and Reviews, Reading Tests and Reviews) was received favorably by only 35.6% of the total group. The organizational subgroups responded significantly different on this question, however. Only 18.6% of the ASCA members supported the possibility of a hard cover subject matter collection, while proportionately three times as many of the APA Division 15 members (58.6%) supported the possibility of a hard cover subject matter publication. The differences in endorsement percentages may relate to the relatively high cost of subject matter publications, and the availability of such funds among specific professional subgroups. These data might reflect the fact that the groups responsible for the day-to-day operations

Table 9
Number of individuals and percent choosing "yes" for the sub-parts of Question 8: Which of the following new methods of dissemination of test reviews would you patronize?

Group	reprint service		review subscription service		quarterly journal		hard cover subject matter collections	
	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes
Total Group	978	63.8	986	67.8	1019	65.8	973	35.6
AERA, Div. D	94	63.8	95	68.4	101	69.3	91	50.6
ARCA	91	60.4	91	61.5	95	74.7	91	34.1
ASCA	90	55.6	91	76.9	92	65.2	86	18.6
AMEG	115	77.4	117	75.2	124	73.4	115	34.8
NVGA	111	63.1	115	69.6	115	75.6	111	21.6
SPTPA	91	65.9	92	60.9	92	59.8	93	35.5
APA, Div. 12	70	62.9	70	70.0	71	46.5	69	37.7
APA, Div. 14	85	65.9	83	67.5	83	48.2	83	41.0
APA, Div. 15	71	52.1	70	55.7	74	64.9	70	58.6
APA, Div. 16	69	69.6	70	71.4	78	64.1	72	37.5
APA, Div. 17	91	60.4	92	65.2	94	70.2	92	30.4
Chi-square	18.3		15.8		37.7		47.8	
df	10		10		10		10	
p	<.05		N.S.		<.01		<.01	

of service agencies (e.g., ASCA, NVGA, APA Division 17) have less funding available for such purchases than those involved in research (e.g., APA Division 15 and AERA Division D). Alternatively, these results may reflect the perceived archival and research function of the "collections" of reviews and/or the delay in publication specified by the "5-year interval" clause in the question.

Taken together, however, the three new dissemination mechanisms suggested in the survey-- a reprint service, a review subscription service, and a quarterly journal--were favorably received by about two out of every three of the individuals included in this survey, while the hard cover subject matter collection was endorsed by only one out of three people surveyed. This "desire to patronize" the new approaches to dissemination of test reviews implies a very large group of potential subscribers for any or all of the proposed publication services.

Who should review tests?

One of the concerns of the IACTR representatives was that of determining whether changes were desirable in the test reviewing process as it is currently carried out. This included a concern with developing new sources of reviewers, or new ways of developing test reviews. Accordingly, the following question was asked of test users: "Who should review tests (assuming that each choice is among "experts" in the field)? a) one expert only; b) more than one expert, but independently of each other; c) more than one expert in consultation with each other; d) a panel of experts chosen specifically for tests of a given type; e) a panel of experts who continuously review all tests." Test users were asked to reply "yes" or "no" to each of these five alternatives. In addition, the following question was asked "Which is the most appropriate type of reviewing process?", in order to obtain a comparative statement concerning the five possibilities previously presented.

The results of the responses to this series of questions are shown in Table 10. In the total group only 5% indicated that "only one expert" should review tests. Differences among the organizational subgroups were statistically significant however, with less than 1% of the NVGA members supporting this alternative, but 12.5% of the APA Division 14 members indicating that only one expert should review tests. Of the total group, 78.4% supported the second alternative--"more than one expert, but independently of each other". Again, differences among subgroups were statistically significant with only 67.6% of NVGA members supporting this alternative while 88.5% of APA Division 17 members supported this method of test reviewing, the most common one in use now.

Insert Table 10 about here

The possibility of test reviews being done by more than one expert in consultation with each other was supported by only 43.9% of the total group. Large and statistically significant between group differences were observed on this question. Only 23.3% of APA Division 15 members supported the use of "experts in consultation", whereas proportionally twice as many of the ASCA members (59.8%) supported this possibility. On the question of a "panel of

Table 10

Number of individuals and percent choosing "yes" for the sub-parts of Question 10: Who should review tests (assuming that each choice is among "experts" in the field)?

Group	a. one expert only		b. more than one, but independently		c. more than one, in consultation		d. panel, for specific tests		e. a panel for all tests		Which is the most appropriate type of reviewing process?					
												Percent				
	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	a	b	c	d	e
Total Group	887	5.0	980	78.4	891	43.9	978	79.4	926	41.6	1005	1.6	35.2	8.8	39.9	14.5
AERA, Div. D	80	3.8	93	86.0	83	40.9	94	79.8	82	39.0	95	1.0	47.4	5.3	36.8	9.5
ARCA	85	3.4	97	80.4	85	40.9	92	76.1	87	42.5	91	0.0	36.3	6.6	39.6	17.6
ASCA	79	3.8	81	58.0	82	59.8	85	77.6	84	48.8	95	2.1	21.0	20.0	32.6	24.2
AMEG	104	5.8	111	78.4	102	46.1	119	83.2	109	48.6	119	0.8	30.2	10.1	44.5	14.3
NVGA	106	0.9	111	67.6	106	51.9	118	76.3	115	53.0	121	0.8	27.3	9.9	42.1	19.8
SPTPA	79	5.1	88	76.1	79	53.2	86	84.9	83	41.0	94	2.1	35.1	8.5	40.4	13.8
APA, Div. 12	62	9.7	71	80.3	63	38.1	70	75.7	63	25.4	70	2.9	41.4	5.7	41.4	8.6
APA, Div. 14	80	12.5	85	87.1	80	31.3	82	75.6	83	24.1	86	4.7	45.3	2.3	39.5	8.1
APA, Div. 15	63	3.2	75	85.3	60	23.3	73	79.4	67	37.3	71	0.0	47.9	7.0	35.2	9.9
APA, Div. 16	65	1.5	72	75.0	66	50.0	71	85.9	67	44.8	72	2.8	23.6	11.1	45.8	16.7
APA, Div. 17	84	7.1	96	88.5	85	40.0	88	79.5	86	41.9	91	1.1	38.5	7.7	39.6	13.2
Chi-square	20.9		43.4		32.8		7.3		28.5		73.7					
df	10		10		10		10		10		40					
P	<.05		<.01		<.01		N.S.		<.01		<.01					

reviewers", a method almost never used in current test reviewing procedures, a surprising 79.4% of the total group endorsed this possibility. It should be noted that this percentage is about the same as the percentage endorsing the current method of having more than one independent test review. On this question there were no statistically significant differences among groups, indicating that all of the groups sampled were in agreement on this question. When the question was posed as "a panel of test reviewers for all tests" (as compared to a panel for specific tests) the percentage endorsing this alternative dropped to 41.6% for the total group. The responses to this question were more similar to the responses to the question of "more than one expert in consultation with each other", since the two methods are fairly similar. Again, significant differences were found between the groups with 24.1% of APA Division 14 members responding positively while over half (53.0%) of NVGA members supported this alternative.

On a comparative basis, within the total group the second and fourth alternatives received almost equal percentages of first choice. About 35% of the total group supported the current method of "more than one expert, but independently" as the most appropriate type of reviewing process, while 39.9% (or slightly more) supported the possibility of "a panel of test reviewers for specific tests". As might be expected from the previous responses, statistically significant between group differences were observed in percentage responding to each of the five alternatives as "the most appropriate type of test reviewing process". Four of the subgroups (AERA Division D, and Divisions 12, 14 and 15 of APA), chose the current method of reviewing as the most appropriate method. However, in each case the "panel for specific tests" alternative was second highest, and for APA Division 12 members the percentages for the two methods were equal.

For the remaining seven groups, the most appropriate method of test reviewing was indicated to be "a panel for specific tests". However, ASCA members divided their choices almost equally among the last four alternatives as compared to members of APA Divisions 14 and 15 which were heavily in favor of the second and fourth alternatives.

It is interesting to note that the percentages choosing the alternative "more than one expert in consultation with each other" varied from a low of 2.3% for APA Division 14 to 20% for ASCA members. In terms of "a panel for all tests", 8.1% of APA Division 14 members felt this the most appropriate method while proportionately three times as many of the ASCA members (24.2%) felt that to be the most appropriate method of reviewing tests. The alternative of "one expert only" was uniformly selected to be the least appropriate test reviewing process with percentages of from 0% (APA Div. 15 members) to only 4.7% (APA Division 14) choosing that as the most appropriate test reviewing process. These data seem to suggest, therefore, that tests should be reviewed by multiple individuals, but the exact mechanism for implementation appears to differ from organization to organization.

Other results of the surveys

Test users survey

Obtaining information on tests. Test users were also asked "In choosing a test for a specific purpose how do you currently obtain information?". The results of the responses to this question are shown in Table 11. Among the

total group 80.4% indicated that they "asked colleagues" for information on a test. The subgroup differences were not significant on this question. Only 39.4% of the total group indicated they "consult test experts". Subgroup response differences were statistically significant. About 79% of the respondents indicated that they "search journals" to obtain information on tests, with the differences among subgroups significant only at the 10% level. On the question of "consulting the Mental Measurements Yearbooks", 90.7% of the total group indicated that they do use those publications as a source of information. However, for this question, significant differences were found among the organizational subgroups. Only 77.9% of the ASCA members indicated "consulting Mental Measurements Yearbooks" as a source of information, while 98.4% of the AMEG group (or virtually all of the AMEG members) use the MMYs as a source of information on tests. Among the total group, 21.8% indicated that they use "other" sources of information on tests. An analysis of the "open-end" responses to this question indicated that the majority of test users do one of the following to obtain information on tests (in decreasing order of appearance): 1) read the technical manual, 2) write to test publishers for information, 3) examine a specimen set of the test, 4) talk to test salesmen, or 5) experiment with the test in trial administrations or in their own research.

Insert Table 11 about here

When test users were asked to indicate which of the five sources of information were their "primary source" of information on tests, statistically significant differences appeared among the 11 subgroups. In the total group, 44.6% indicated that the Mental Measurements Yearbooks was their primary source of infomation on tests. Similar results were obtained for nine of the eleven subgroups, with percentages choosing the Mental Measurements Yearbooks as the primary source of infomation ranging from 27.3% for APA Division 12 members to 57.1% for AERA Division D members. Among the two clinical subgroups, (APA Division 12 and SPTPA) the Mental Measurements Yearbooks did not appear as the primary source of infomation on tests. For SPTPA, the Mental Measurements Yearbooks and "colleagues" obtained equal percentages of 34.1% as the primary source of information. Among the members of APA Division 12, the primary source of information was "colleagues" with 36.4%, while the Mental Measurements Yearbooks obtained only 27.3%. Apparently very little use is made of test experts as primary sources of information, the percentages varying from 0% for three of the 11 groups to 10.8% for AMEG members.

The Mental Measurements Yearbooks. Two additional questions were asked of test users concerning the Mental Measurements Yearbooks, since it was a primary source of information on tests. Table 12 shows a distribution of responses to determine the accessibility of the Mental Measurement Yearbooks to test users. As few as 1.8% of AERA Division D members said that they had access to "none" of the Mental Measurements Yearbooks, while 26.2% of ASCA members did not have access to any of the Mental Measurements Yearbooks. Table 12 also shows the distribution of percentages responding positively to the question of access to each of the volumes of MMYs, with uniformly high percentages of response to the most recent volume.

Insert Table 12 about here

Table 11

Number of individuals and percent choosing "yes" for the sub-parts of Question 9: In choosing a test for a specific purpose, how do you currently obtain information?

	a. ask colleagues		b. consult test expert		c. search journals		d. consult the MMYs		e. other		If you checked "yes" for more than one... indicate your primary source of info.					
												Percent				
Group	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	a	b	c	d	e
Total Group	1037	80.4	961	39.4	1029	78.6	1053	90.7	1147	21.8	913	23.3	4.8	20.8	44.6	6.5
AERA, Div. D	94	81.9	91	48.4	95	87.4	102	96.1	112	24.1	84	13.1	2.4	14.3	57.1	13.1
ARCA	100	76.0	92	45.6	94	76.6	96	90.6	103	22.3	86	20.9	10.5	24.4	39.5	4.7
ASCA	95	84.2	92	38.0	94	68.1	95	77.9	103	17.5	85	32.9	7.1	16.5	41.2	2.4
AMEG	121	82.6	112	42.0	123	74.8	126	98.4	132	23.5	111	19.8	10.8	14.4	46.8	8.1
NVGA	123	79.7	115	44.3	122	76.2	121	90.9	130	18.5	104	25.0	5.8	17.3	49.0	2.9
SPTPA	96	82.3	87	27.6	99	80.8	96	79.2	107	15.9	82	34.1	0.0	30.5	34.1	1.2
APA, Div. 12	74	81.1	68	36.8	71	76.1	75	85.3	85	20.0	66	36.4	0.0	27.3	27.3	9.1
APA, Div. 14	87	80.5	80	27.5	84	76.2	88	96.6	98	22.4	73	26.0	1.4	19.2	43.8	9.6
APA, Div. 15	78	75.6	70	42.9	77	80.5	80	91.2	90	23.3	71	16.9	5.6	22.5	53.5	1.4
APA, Div. 16	72	79.2	65	32.3	75	85.3	76	92.1	87	21.8	67	20.9	0.0	25.4	47.8	6.0
APA, Div. 17	97	80.4	89	42.7	95	85.3	98	95.9	100	31.0	84	13.1	4.8	22.6	46.4	13.1
Chi-square	4.10		18.6		17.8		55.5					99.5				
df	10		10		10		10					40				
P	N.S.		<.05		<.10		<.01					<.01				

Table 12
Percent responding to the sub-parts of Question 11:
To which volumes of the Mental Measurements Yearbooks
do you have ready access (e.g., in a nearby library)?

Group	N	None	Volume 6	Volume 5	Volume 4	Volumes 3, 2, or 1
Total Group	1147	8.7	70.5	71.1	59.5	46.8
AERA, Div. D	112	1.8	85.7	89.3	78.6	67.9
ARCA	103	6.8	68.0	79.6	64.1	49.5
ASCA	103	26.2	52.4	46.6	34.0	28.2
AMEG	132	6.1	78.0	76.5	62.9	45.4
NVGA	130	6.2	60.8	60.0	46.9	39.2
SPTPA	107	11.2	66.4	64.5	53.3	37.4
APA, Div. 12	85	16.5	60.0	60.0	45.9	37.6
APA, Div. 14	98	2.0	70.4	76.5	65.3	49.0
APA, Div. 15	90	5.6	80.0	77.8	70.0	64.4
APA, Div. 16	87	11.5	67.8	64.4	54.0	36.8
APA, Div. 17	100	5.0	85.0	85.0	79.0	60.0

Table 13 shows the percentage distribution of responses to the question "How valuable do you consider the comprehensive test bibliographies that appear in the Mental Measurements Yearbooks?". The response alternatives were as follows: "Extremely valuable--they should definitely be continued; valuable--they should be continued if possible; indifferent; not valuable--the space could be better spent on more or different kinds of reviews and; worthless--they take up too much space and they raise the price of the Mental Measurements Yearbooks unnecessarily." As Table 13 shows, only 1% of the respondents in the total group indicated that the bibliographies are "worthless". Only 5.5% indicated that they were "not valuable". Over 75% of the respondents indicated that they were "valuable" or "extremely valuable".

Insert Table 13 about here

As Table 13 also shows, significant differences were obtained in the distributions of responses to this question among the 11 subgroups. There was a tendency for members of APA Division 12 to view the Mental Measurements Yearbooks bibliographies as either "indifferent" or "not valuable", while members of AERA Division D were least likely to respond to those to alternatives. The percentage of respondents indicating that the bibliographies in the Mental Measurements Yearbooks were "extremely valuable" varied from 14.0% for ASCA members to 38.5% for AERA Division D members. These percentages undoubtedly reflect the differential activities of these groups as they relate to the use of bibliographic materials.

Journal Editors Survey

Several additional questions were asked of journal editors, using two forms of the Journal Editors Survey Questionnaire. One form of the questionnaire was designed for use with those journals that did publish test reviews; the other was designed for those journals which do not review tests. In addition, several questions were common between the two forms.

Table 14 shows the percent of journal editors responding positively to each of the questions that were common to both forms of the Journal Editors Survey Questionnaire. As Table 14 indicates, approximately 30% of the journal editors considered test reviewing to be a desirable function of the journal. Thirty percent also actively solicited test reviews for the journal or considered publication of submitted test reviews which had not previously been solicited. When journal editors were asked whether they felt it desirable that there be at least two reviews of a test in the same journal, 63.2% of the 19 journal editors endorsed that alternative. Of the 19 journal editors responding to the question in terms of whether it was desirable to have two reviews of the test appear in different journals, 84.2% responded affirmatively.

Insert Table 14 about here

One question in the journal editors survey was concerned with the general question of whether current methods of test reviewing were meeting the needs of the test reviewing field. Only 10% of the 20 journal editors responding to that question felt that this was true.

Table 13
Percentage response distributions for Question 12:
How valuable do you consider the comprehensive test bibliographies that appear in the Mental Measurements Yearbooks?

Group	N	extremely valuable	valuable	indifferent	not valuable	worthless
Total Group	1062	24.2	51.8	17.5	5.5	1.0
AERA, Div. D	104	38.5	51.0	5.8	3.8	0.0
ARCA	99	22.2	54.5	17.2	6.1	0.0
ASCA	93	14.0	59.1	20.4	4.3	2.2
AMEG	125	24.8	57.6	14.4	3.2	0.0
NVGA	123	22.8	48.0	23.6	5.7	0.0
SPTPA	96	27.1	43.8	24.0	4.2	1.0
APA, Div. 12	78	24.4	43.6	17.9	11.5	2.6
APA, Div. 14	87	17.2	63.2	14.9	3.4	1.1
APA, Div. 15	81	30.9	43.2	21.0	3.7	1.2
APA, Div. 16	78	20.5	47.4	19.2	9.0	3.8
APA, Div. 17	98	22.4	55.1	15.3	7.0	0.0

χ^2(40 df) = 65.6 p <.01

Table 14
Responses of journal editors to additional common questions

	N	%Yes
Do you consider test reviewing to be a desirable function of your Journal?	21	38.1
Do you actively solicit test reviews for your Journal?	22	31.8
Do you consider publication of submitted test reviews which have not been solicited	20	30.0
Do you feel that it is desirable to have at least two reviews of a test appear in...		
1. the same journal	19	63.2
2. different journals	19	84.2
Do you feel that current methods of dissemination of test reviews (i.e., the Mental Measurements Yearbook and two or three journals that publish reviews regularly) are adequately meeting the needs in the test reviewing field?	20	10.0

This should be considered in contrast to the 38% which considered test reviewing to be a desirable function of their journal. In other words, while the journal editors felt that the needs were not being met in the field, they apparently were unwilling or unable to consider test reviewing as an important function of the journal.

Table 15 shows the responses of those journals which did review tests to the questions specifically asked of those journals. The first two questions were concerned with possibility of IACTR obtaining copies of previous and future reviews that had been published in journals for distribution to test users either by free distribution or by purchase of test users. Eight journals replied to these questions. In response to the question of whether IACTR could reprint existing test reviews, half of the journals responded positively, half responded indeterminantly, and none responded negatively. When the question was posed in terms of whether IACTR could sell reprints of past reviews to test users, one journal said "no", two said "yes" and three replied indeterminantly. The responses to the second question concerning future test reviews were identical to those of the first question.

Insert Table 15 about here

Table 15 shows that four of the six journals replying to the question concerning the influence of test reviews on selection decisions made by the readers of the journals replied that they felt that their test reviews were "somewhat influential"; two replied that they "did not know".

Despite the fact that most of the journal editors said that the needs in the field were not currently being met, three of the four journals that currently publish test reviews indicated that they still plan to publish only about the same number of test reviews; only one indicated plans to increase the number of test reviews it will publish. On the question of whether a new test reviewing journal would have any effect on plans of current journals that publish test reviews, two of the five that replied to that question indicated that they would publish "fewer test reviews" under those circumstances, two indicated "no change", and one indicated they would publish "more test reviews".

While journal editors generally indicated that the current numbers of test reviews are not meeting the needs in the field, but also generally indicated no intention to increase the number of test reviews being published, five of seven replying journal editors indicated that they thought their readers were as equally interested in test reviews as in other content (even though test reviews currently occupy only a small proportion of the space available). Two journal editors indicated that their readers were more or much more interested in other content than in test reviews.

Table 15 also shows the percent of journal editors responding "yes" to each of seven questions describing possible problems they may have had in scheduling test reviews. As the results indicate, the problem that was responded to positively by most of the eight journal editors was that of "obtaining research data on tests from publishers", closely followed by "obtaining research

Table 15

Responses to additional questions by editors of journals that did review tests

	N	%
1. would it be consistent with the policies of your organization to give the Inter-Association Council on Test Reviewing permission to copy and/or reprint test reviews that have appeared in your journal for:		
a. distribution to test users on request		
yes	3	50.0
no	0	0.0
cannot say at this time	3	50.0
b. sale to test users		
yes	2	33.3
no	1	16.7
cannot say at this time	3	50.0
2. would your organization consider selling or giving reprints of future test reviews to the Inter-Association Council on Test Reviewing for subsequent:		
a. distribution to test users on request		
yes	3	50.0
no	0	0.0
cannot say at this time	3	50.0
b. sale to test users		
yes	2	33.3
no	1	16.7
cannot say at this time	3	50.0
How influential do you feel your test reviews are on test selection decisions made by your readers?		
very influential	0	0.0
somewhat influential	4	66.7
of little influence	0	0.0
not influential	0	0.0
do not know	2	33.3
What are your future plans concerning test reviews		
emphasize them more	1	25.0
publish about the same number	3	75.0
de-emphasize them	0	0.0
get out of the business of test reviewing altogether	0	0.0
If a new journal which was devoted exclusively to test reviews were started, what would you most likely do?		
stop publishing test reviews	0	0.0
publish fewer test reviews	2	40.0
no change--continue publishing about the same number	2	40.0
publish more test reviews	1	20.0

-continued-

Table 15 (continued)

	N	%
How interested do you think readers of your Journal are in test reviews as compared to the other content in your Journal?		
much more interested in test reviews than other content	0	0.0
more interested in test reviews	0	0.0
equally interested in test reviews and other content	5	71.4
more interested in other content than test reviews	1	14.3
much more interested in other content than test reviews	1	14.3

Following are some problems you might have had in scheduling test reviews. Please indicate for each statement below whether or not it has been a problem for your journal.	N	%Yes
1. obtaining tests from publishers for review	7	42.9
2. obtaining research data on tests from publishers	6	66.7
3. obtaining research data on tests from the literature	5	60.0
4. identifying competent reviewers	6	33.3
5. obtaining the cooperation of test reviewers to review tests	8	37.6
6. obtaining reviews from reviewers in time to meet publication deadlines	7	14.3
7. knowing what tests your readers are interested in having reviewed	7	14.3

data on tests from the literature". Almost half of the editors indicated that they had problems in "obtaining tests from publishers for review", while only one of the responding editors indicated that their problems included knowing "what tests the readers were interested in having reviewed" or "obtaining reviews from the reviewers in time to meet publication deadlines". On a comparative basis, the most serious problems were identified as numbers 1 and 3 with one of the respondents indicating that number 5 was his most serious problem.

The journal editors were also asked to indicate whether IACTR's assistance in solving some of the problems would help the journal publish more reviews, and 71.4% (or five of the seven journal editors) responded affirmatively. Four journal editors indicated other specific items of assistance that IACTR could provide in the area of test reviewing. The comments relating to additional services IACTR could provide journals are as follows: "Encourage different types of reviews, that is research vs. school use of tests"; "Provide reviews"; "Number one above is significant and if publishers become active members of IACTR perhaps problems would be resolved"; and "Need help in identifying competent reviewers in a variety of areas."

Several journal editors also provided additional comments on the open-ended questions provided in the journal survey. These comments are reproduced in Appendix C.

A number of journals were identified as those which did not publish test reviews for their readers. Table 16 shows the response distributions to the questions asked of these journals. According to the journal editors, the major reason why their journals did not publish test reviews was that "There were too many other pressures for publication of the regular content of our journal": 44.5% of those journal editors responding positively to one or more of the questions indicated that to be the major reason why their journal did not publish test reviews. When each question was asked separately, 71.4% responded affirmatively to question 4; the lowest percentage of affirmative response was to question 2. In general, the journal editors did not feel that their lack of publication of test reviews was because the readers were not interested in test reviews, because they had insufficient funds, because it was too difficult to obtain materials, or too difficult to find competent reviewers.

Insert Table 16 about here

The final question asked of the journals not reviewing tests concerned whether IACTR's activities would assist them in developing a program of publishing test reviews. Slightly over 30% of the respondents indicated that they would be more likely to publish reviews if IACTR provided assistance both in obtaining tests for review and identifying reviewers. However, 43.8% of the journal editors indicated that regardless of what IACTR did they would not be likely to publish test reviews.

Table 16

Responses to additional questions by editors of journals that did not review tests

For each statement below, indicate whether or not it is a reason why your journal does not publish test reviews:	N	%Yes
1. the readers of the journal aren't interested in test reviews	13	23.1
2. lack of an appreciable number of tests in areas of concern to our readers	13	7.7
3. other sources are providing enough test reviews to meet the needs	14	42.8
4. there are too many other pressures for publication of the regular content of our journal	14	71.4
5. lack of sufficient funds	13	15.4
6. it is too difficult to obtain materials for review	13	23.1
7. it is too difficult to find competent reviewers	13	38.5

Would your journal be more likely to publish test reviews if the Inter-Association Council on Test Reviewing provided ...	N	%
assistance both in obtaining tests for review and in identifying reviewers	5	31.2
assistance only in obtaining tests for review	2	12.5
assistance only in identifying test reviewers	1	6.2
other assistance	1	6.2
none of the above	7	43.8

Suggestions of the respondents

Appendix D contains the suggestions of the respondents derived from the open-end responses on the test user survey questionnaire. The responses are organized according to four general headings as follows: 1) general suggestions, 2) suggestions concerning test reviewers; 3) suggestions on the nature of test reviews, and 4) suggestions on the dissemination of test reviews. Many of these comments provide valuable insights into the problems of test users as well as important suggestions for the improvement of test reviewing procedures and services.

Summary and Implications

Problems abound in test reviewing. About 80% of test users said that more test reviews are needed; 95% of journal editors agreed. Different organizational subgroups expressed different feelings about the nature of current test reviews; some groups said they were "too practical" while some felt they were "too technical". Only about half of those test users surveyed were satisfied with the "depth" of current test reviews. Clearly, there is a need for different kinds of test reviews, more test reviews, and test reviews tailored to different audiences.

Test reviews are not being made available enough to many audiences. Only one in three test users felt that he could get access to reviews when he needed them. Test reviews are also not being produced frequently enough. About eight out of ten test users are dissatisfied with the frequency of test reviews. There is clearly a need for new programs and mechanisms for the dissemination of test reviews.

What directions should these new programs follow? Seven out of ten test users and journal editors said more test reviews are needed; nine out of ten said different types of test reviews are needed; only six of ten said that more test bibliographies are needed. Of these three general classes of needs, different types of test reviews is clearly the most urgent need.

Nine out of ten of test users and journal editors supported the need for "comprehensive and integrative", "comparative" and "topical" reviews; different organizations expressed different needs. Journal editors disagreed with test users on "reviews of new tests"; three-fourths of editors felt these to be important, compared to only six of ten test users. These data imply two conclusions: 1) different kinds of reviews need to be developed and aimed at different populations; and 2) journal editors perceive only some of these needs accurately.

To focus distribution of reviews where they are needed, new approaches to dissemination are required, with different kinds of dissemination appropriate for different groups. At least six of ten test users felt that test reviews should be disseminated in a variety of ways, including more reviews in existing journals, separates available by mail, separate subject matter publications and a separate periodical publication. Journal editors, however, tended to disagree with test users on how reviews should be disseminated.

About two of every three test users said they would subscribe to at least one of three new methods of dissemination of reviews, including a reprint service, a review subscription service and a quarterly journal. In general, responses differed among the organizational subgroups, reflecting their different needs for test reviews. The data suggest, however, that new approaches to the dissemination of test reviews are likely to be well received by test users, and that a large market exists for new reviewing services.

Test users also supported new procedures for producing test reviews. While many indicated that reviews should be done by independent experts, four of ten supported the idea of a panel of reviewers for all tests, while about eight of ten test users felt that reviews could be produced by a panel

of reviewers constituted to review specific tests. These data suggest that some changes may also be desirable in the way test reviews are being done.

In general, the surveys support the contention that important changes are needed in the field of test reviewing. Not only should new ways of producing reviews be developed, but new kinds of reviews are needed, tailored to different audiences, as well as innovative ways of making these new reviews readily available to those who need them, when they need them. Specifically, these data suggest that IACTR should concentrate on the development of comparative, comprehensive and integrative and topical reviews, tailored for specific audiences; should explore the possibilities of using panels of reviewers for specific tests; and should attempt to implement an integrated dissemination approach including a quarterly journal of reviews, with an associated review subscription service for more focused distribution, as well as distributing reprints of single reviews or review packages by mail-order service. In these ways, IACTR can begin to take important steps in the solution of the pressing problems evident in test reviewing.

Appendix A

Table A-1

Highest Academic Degree Held by Respondents, in Percentages

Group	N	None	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Doctor's Degree
Total Group	1,116	0.1	- 1.2	37.8	60.9
AERA, Div. D	109	0.0	0.0	16.5	83.5
ARCA	103	0.0	1.9	57.3	40.8
ASCA	100	0.0	3.0	90.0	7.0
AMEG	125	0.0	0.8	72.8	26.4
NVGA	127	0.8	3.2	70.1	26.0
SPTPA	103	0.0	1.9	22.3	75.8
APA, Div. 12	84	0.0	0.0	77.1	92.9
APA, Div. 14	95	0.0	1.0	9.5	89.5
APA, Div. 15	88	0.0	0.0	8.0	92.0
APA, Div. 16	83	0.0	0.0	22.9	77.1
APA, Div. 17	99	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9

Table A-2

Primary Type of Work of Respondents, in Percentages

Group	N	Teaching	Research	Clinical Eval.	Educational Eval.	Other	Multiple Response
Total Group	1,120	13.8	9.3	10.4	11.9	27.1[a]	27.5
AERA, Div. D	109	21.1	27.5	0.0	11.0	8.3	32.1
ARCA	103	12.6	4.8	16.5	5.8	32.0	28.2
ASCA	103	5.8	0.0	1.9	20.4	57.3	14.6
AMEG	127	7.1	4.7	4.7	24.4	37.8	21.2
NVGA	128	7.0	1.6	3.9	21.9	44.5	21.1
SPTPA	104	8.6	7.7	34.6	1.0	11.5	36.5
APA, Div. 12	84	20.2	3.6	21.4	2.4	14.3	38.1
APA, Div. 14	96	15.6	21.9	2.1	2.1	34.4	24.0
APA, Div. 15	84	25.0	21.4	8.3	4.8	10.8	29.8
APA, Div. 16	83	10.8	4.8	13.2	16.9	10.8	43.4
APA, Div. 17	99	24.2	7.1	12.1	12.1	23.2	21.2

Table A-3

Principal Place of Employmen of Respondents, in Percentages

Group	N	College or University	Business or Industry	Self-Employed	Elementary or Secondary School	Public Agency	Private Agency	Other	Multiple Response
Total Group	1,121	38.1	4.8	5.6	22.8	10.6	4.7	7.8[a]	5.5
AERA, Div. D	108	65.7	4.6	0.0	5.6	6.5	0.9	14.8	1.9
ARCA	103	28.2	2.9	5.8	7.8	19.4	15.5	11.7	8.7
ASCA	103	7.8	0.0	0.0	85.4	1.0	0.0	1.9	3.9
AMEG	127	31.5	3.9	0.0	43.3	6.3	3.1	9.4	2.4
NVGA	128	27.3	2.3	3.1	44.5	5.5	1.6	12.5	3.1
SPTPA	104	30.8	0.0	11.5	2.9	9.6	15.4	17.3	12.5
APA, Div. 12.	84	40.5	1.2	21.4	3.6	13.1	4.8	10.7	4.8
APA, Div. 14	95	40.0	33.7	6.3	0.0	3.2	1.0	10.5	5.3
APA, Div. 15	88	67.0	3.4	2.3	5.7	8.0	1.1	9.1	3.4
APA, Div. 16	83	26.5	0.0	10.8	28.9	7.2	4.8	12.0	9.6
APA, Div. 17	98	60.2	2.0	6.1	7.1	7.1	4.1	6.1	7.1

[a]1.9% of total group employed in school administrations, 1.0% in non-profit research agencies, and remainder in miscellaneous categories.

Table A-4

Age and Sex of Respondents

Group	Age				Sex		
	N	Q1	Median	Q3	N	% Male	% Female
Total Group	1,113	38	45	53	1,129	75.3	24.7
AERA, Div. D	108	36	42	49	109	82.6	17.4
ARCA	101	35	45	50	103	77.7	22.3
ASCA	101	35	44	50	102	59.8	40.2
AMEG	127	34	41	49	130	59.2	40.8
NVGA	128	36	43	52	130	68.5	31.5
SPTPA	101	37	46	53	104	69.2	30.8
APA, Div. 12	84	41	48	58	84	79.8	20.2
APA, Div. 14	97	41	50	57	97	96.9	3.1
APA, Div. 15	88	44	49	55	89	86.5	13.5
APA, Div. 16	81	42	49	58	83	67.5	32.5
APA, Div. 17	97	40	46	56	98	88.8	11.2

Table A-5

Types of Assessment Instruments Used by Respondents

Group	Intelligence or General Ability		Specific Aptitude		Projective Personality		Objective Personality		Interests		Reading		Achievement		Other	
	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes	N	%Yes
Total Group	1043	96.4	976	82.5	942	58.7	927	71.5	972	80.6	937	73.1	966	38.5	1147	18.6[a]
AERA, Div. D	94	94.7	87	86.2	78	32.0	88	72.7	88	79.5	83	83.1	90	94.4	112	23.2
ARCA	95	96.8	92	92.4	91	63.7	90	77.8	93	89.2	85	71.7	88	83.0	103	24.2
ASCA	100	98.0	92	84,8	79	25.3	79	39.2	94	89.4	97	87.6	99	99.0	103	8.7
AMEG	123	98.4	124	89.5	105	45.7	104	65.4	119	88.2	118	78.0	117	92.3	132	86.3
NVGA	120	95.8	116	91.4	102	36.3	104	62.5	117	88.0	114	83.3	118	93.2	130	90.8
SPSPA	98	95.9	86	54.6	100	97.0	87	72.4	84	50.0	83	50.6	84	54.8	107	24.3
APA, Div. 12	79	100.0	69	66.7	75	94.7	70	81.4	69	75.4	64	54.7	65	60.0	85	28.2
APA, Div. 14	86	91.9	87	87.4	76	42.1	83	84.3	85	78.8	74	48.6	79	64.5	98	21.4
APA, Div. 15	74	89.2	67	77.6	68	55.9	65	69.2	67	73.1	64	68.8	70	87.1	90	22.2
APA, Div. 16	78	100.0	64	75.0	75	85.3	65	70.8	64	65.6	70	90.0	71	93.0	87	17.2
APA, Div. 17	96	97.9	92	88.0	93	67.7	92	91.3	92	93.5	85	74.1	85	82.4	100	17.0

[a]2.3% of total group reported using perceptual-motor tests, 1.8% used measures of attitudes and values, 1.0% used "self-designed" instruments, 1.0% used neurophysiological measures, 1.0% used measures of organicity, and remainder reported using miscellaneous instruments ranging from biographical inventories to measures of thought disorder and work samples.

Table A-6

Percentage Distributions of Type of Measuring Instruments Most Often Used by Respondents

Group	N	Intelligence or General Ability	Specific Aptitude	Projective Personality	Objective Personality	Interests	Reading	Achievement	Other
Total Group	636	33.2	11.2	13.1	8.2	6.4	2.1	20.1	3.8
AERA, Div. D	67	20.9	11.9	1.5	6.0	4.5	9.0	37.3	9.0
ARCA	61	41.0	21.3	4.9	4.9	11.5	3.3	8.2	4.9
ASCA	61	29.5	8.2	3.3	0.0	3.3	11.5	44.3	0.0
AMEG	75	40.0	10.7	1.3	6.7	12.0	4.0	24.0	1.3
NVGA	64	21.9	18.8	3.1	1.6	17.2	3.1	32.8	1.6
SPTPA	61	19.7	0.0	62.3	13.1	0.0	1.6	0.0	3.3
APA, Div. 12	47	44.7	4.2	36.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
APA, Div. 14	51	41.1	31.4	0.0	13.7	3.9	0.0	5.9	3.9
APA, Div. 15	54	33.3	1.9	9.3	9.3	1.8	7.4	31.5	5.6
APA, Div. 16	40	60.0	2.5	12.5	5.0	2.5	2.5	10.0	5.0
APA, Div. 17	55	25.4	9.1	16.4	21.8	9.1	0.0	14.5	3.6

Table A-7

Percent of Group Sampled Holding Membership in Each Organization

Group Sampled	N	AERA Div.D	ARCA	ASCA	AMEG	NCME	NVGA	SPTPA	Divisions of APA 5	12	14	15	16	17
Total Group	1,147	20.1	12.2	24.3	21.4	11.9	33.8	11.1	8.8	19.6	9.9	15.7	12.3	20.4
AERA, Div. D	112	90.2	1.8	6.2	20.5	42.9	10.7	0.0	18.8	1.8	3.6	34.8	7.1	7.1
ARCA	103	2.9	91.3	15.5	19.4	3.9	62.1	1.0	3.9	7.8	1.0	4.8	5.8	42.7
ASCA	103	3.9	1.0	90.3	7.8	0.0	41.7	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.9	1.9
AMEG	132	15.1	7.6	57.8	90.1	11.3	53.0	0.0	6.1	2.3	0.8	9.1	6.8	13.6
NVGA	130	6.2	9.2	52.3	23.1	5.4	86.2	1.5	6.9	3.8	1.5	4.6	3.1	12.3
SPTPA	67	5.6	1.9	0.0	1.9	3.7	6.5	90.6	4.7	62.6	0.0	3.7	7.5	8.4
APA, Div. 12	85	0.0	2.4	1.2	1.2	0.0	4.7	15.3	1.2	85.9	2.4	3.5	4.7	10.6
APA, Div. 14	98	8.2	0.0	0.0	5.1	8.2	13.3	1.0	17.3	7.1	91.8	4.1	0.0	15.3
APA, Div. 15	90	51.1	2.2	3.3	12.2	24.4	11.1	4.4	20.0	12.2	3.3	75.6	16.7	17.8
APA, Div. 16	87	21.8	3.4	5.7	9.2	11.5	11.5	8.0	3.4	26.4	1.1	21.8	87.4	14.9
APA, Div. 17	100	16.0	12.0	10.0	18.0	18.0	43.0	2.0	15.0	25.0	9.0	19.0	9.0	84.0

Appendix B

Journals cooperating in journal editors survey

American Educational Research Journal
American Journal of Mental Deficiency
British Journal of Educational Psychology
Child Development
Journal of Applied Psychology
Journal of Child Psychology, Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines
Journal of Clinical Psychology
Journal of College Student Personnel
Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology
Journal of Counseling Psychology
Journal of Educational Measurement
Journal of Educational Psychology
Journal of Genetic Psychology
Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment
Occupational Psychology
Perceptual and Motor Skills
Personnel and Guidance Journal
Psychonomic Science
Peview of Educational Research
The Clinical Psychologist
Vocational Guidance Quarterly

Appendix C

Comments of Journal Editors

Each issue of a test review periodical might be devoted to a test or type of test, with articles devoted to: (a) a technical review, giving manual-type information and description; (b) a "survey of literature" paper; (c) several additional papers, each one on its use in a different setting or problem area, e.g., research use, clinical use, use with children, use with institutional populations, etc.; (d) one focusing on measurement problems.

I feel idea of journal makes sense. Perhaps a quarterly. It would not seem unreasonable for this journal to perhaps carry reprints of the reviews originally carried in the publications aimed at specific segments of the test using professionals.

I feel that test reviewing is an official function of the American Psychological Association. Test evaluation is too big a job for private resources.

This journal is governed by policies set by policies set by Publication Board. It is not likely to be one of the APA journals to move in this area. But Publication Board will probably support some moves in this direction.

Our Board of Advisory Editors for this journal has reviewed the issue of test reviewing. It is our feeling that while there is a need for more frequent reviews beyond that provided by Buros and other sources, there was very little agreement that the Journal should embark upon setting up a test review section. As I have indicated earlier, we have on occasion considered favorably a review of a test area or a specific test, where such a review obviously made a significant contribution to new knowledge.

The quality of test reviews need improving. Our readership is not highly concerned with testing and those who are can get this service from other journals. I would not be opposed to supporting quality test review in our journal when appropriate to our readership.

My journal, has a set of charter "empirical studies" which virtually excludes the possibility of publishing test reviews.

I have been in favor of some kind of coordinative activities since the formation of the Council and its predecessor organization. Despite my own special interest in testing, I am finding it a little difficult to get rolling on a test review format for our journal. I would probably want to appoint a test review editor, but he would face some of the same problems. My burden would be lightened appreciably if IACTR would set up some coordinative and consultative services. Perhaps a meeting of journal <u>editors</u> only would be a helpful step.

Generally, practising psychologists tend to adopt tests which meet professional problems in assessment, treatment etc all too uncritically. They have pressing and immediate pressing problems concerning which they have to make an immediate decision. However, if new tests could be objectively criticised, and evaluated, compared with other comparable tests and such findings clearly summarized (a sort of consumer's association publication) in journals and/or separate classified publications, this might assist the adoption of higher standards and encourage production of good tests while discouraging substandard efforts.

Appendix C, cont.

If we don't improve the use of test results--it will be like the goose who laid golden eggs--dead. The problems are more in the mis-use of the results than in the tests. Another area that needs assessment is the non-cognitive and non academic area. Most of the available (and reliable) tests are in the academic areas.

Encourage different types of reviews, that is research vs. school use of tests.

Sorry, to give an unhelpful reply--but this is not an area which we deal with. Research papers may in fact often include material which could be described as "test reviews", but we publish on the strength of the research contribution, not because they are reviews of tests.

Almost all reviews are incompetent. Test authors and publishers should have space to comment on stupid, unperceptive, even inaccurate statements by reviewers. We gave up on Buros years ago. Others are not much better on the average. .... Let me repeat. The adequate test reviewer must have: 1) extensive experience with the test; 2) training in traditional approaches to test construction, standardization and validation; 3) real sophistication in the philosophy of science as it applies to measurement in all sciences. Very few people like this, so almost all reviews poor. Test authors should have an opportunity to try to block (by persuasion) unfair statements by reviewers, and should be guaranteed journal space to reply to (or comment on) reviews, as a matter of fixed policy. Our journals are the only ones which consistently do this. ... Please be super-careful in any steps you take--this is a sensitive field in which most reviews are badly biased, and intellectually incompetent (from a measurement theory point of view). We don't really need more journals, but more intellectual competence.